UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,740	01/23/2006	Heiko Neumetzler	02316.2289USWO	6226

23552 7590 10/17/2008

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
VU, HIEN D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2833	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/565,740	NEUMETZLER, HEIKO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hien D. Vu	2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 July 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/31/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The objections to the drawings and claims objections in the last office action dated 8/30/08 have been withdrawn.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7-11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squitieri (4591225) in view of DE (9400303).

As to claim 1, Squitieri, Figs.I-6 shows a conductor connection module 20 for printed circuit boards comprising: a plurality of contact elements 60, and an integral housing 40 in which the contact elements are arranged, the housing extending from a first end to a second end, the contact elements having a first contact area 64 arranged at the first end of the housing, and the contact elements having a second contact area 70 which is in the form of a contact pin arranged at the second end of the housing, wherein longitudinal axes of the first contacts lie parallel to the surface of the printed circuit board when the conductor connection module is in the installed state on the printed circuit board 76. To form the first contact area to be in the form of an insulation-displacement terminal contact would have been obvious to one with skill in the art since such change is old and well known in the art to obtain the predictable results such as for receiving the wires. For example, DE, Figs. 6-11 show an integral housing (not labeled) which holds contact elements 8 each including a first part with slit 21 read as the recited

insulation-displacement terminal contact and a second part 22 read as the recited contact pin.

As to claim 2, Squitieri shows the contact pins are arranged at right angles to the insulation-displacement terminal contacts.

As to claims 3 and 7, Squitieri shows the housing is an integral plastic housing.

As to claims 8-10, Squitieri shows the housing has a stop surface 84 in order to support the housing on an end surface 80 of the printed circuit board.

As to claims 11 and 16, the claims have substantially similar features as claims 1-3 and 7-10; therefore they are rejected under the similar rationale.

4. Claims 4-6,12-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squitieri (4591225) in view of DE (9400303) as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Smalley, Jr. et al (6050845) and Sommer et al (6095854).

As to claims 4, 6,12, Squitieri in view of DE (303) does not show the housing having fixing pins which are arranged parallel to contact pins. Smalley, Jr., Figs. 1-3 show a housing 12 having fixing pins 26 which are arranged parallel to contact pins 44. It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Squitieri by forming the housing with fixing pins which are arranged parallel to the contact pins, as taught by Smalley, in order to provide properly connection for the connector on the board.

As to claims 5, 13, the claim features have been discussed above.

As to claims 14, 17 and 19, Squitieri shows the housing includes latching tabs 94, 96 on opposite faces of the housing, but Squitieri in view of DE (303) does not show a front panel having an opening, an end of the housing including the insulation-displacement terminals positioned in the opening, the latching tabs latching the housing to the front panel. Sommer, Figs. 9-12 show a front panel 14 having an opening 12, an end of the housing including the insulation-displacement terminals positioned in the opening, latching tabs 22 latching the housing to the front panel. It would have been obvious to one with skill in the art to modify the connector of Squitieri by providing a front panel having an opening, an end of the housing including the insulation-displacement terminals positioned in the opening, the latching tabs latching the housing to the front panel, as taught by Sommer, in order to mount the connector to a panel.

As to claims 15, 18 and 20, the claim features have been discussed above.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 7/31/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the remarks on pages 7-8, Applicant states that replacing the tuning-fork contacts 60 of Squitieri with insulation- displacement terminal contacts would destroy the functionality of the receptacle assembly 20 because the receptacle assembly 20 would be unable to mate with the plug connector 30. The examiner agrees that the receptacle assembly 20 would be unable to mate with the plug connector 30; however, the teaching of the DE (303) is used to modify the structure contacts of the receptacle assembly 20 of Squitieri to allow the contacts to be able to connected with the wires but is not for connection with the contacts of the plug connector.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine the references is to modify the structure contacts of the receptacle assembly 20 of Squitieri so that the receptacle is able to be connected with the wires by using insulation displacement technology.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Squitieri and the German reference does not disclose or suggest an integral housing which holds contact elements including insulation-displacement terminal contacts and contact pins. The Examiner disagrees, German (DE 9400303) clearly discloses and shows an integral housing (not labeled) which holds contact elements 8 each including a first part having slit 21 read as the recited insulation-displacement terminal contact and a second part 22 read as the recited contact pin.

In response to applicant's argument that neither Smalley nor Sommer disclose or suggest an integral housing extending from a first end at which an insulation-displacement terminal contact is arranged to a second end at which a contact pin is arranged. Further, neither Smalley nor Sommer suggests how Squitieri can be modified to replace the tuning-fork contacts 60 of Squitieri with insulation-displacement terminal

contacts without destroying the functionality of the receptacle assembly 20, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

The other remarks appear to be fully addressed in the rejection above.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien D. Vu at telephone number 571-272-2016.

/Hien D. Vu/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2833